vs.

BRIAN WILLIAMS, et al.,

MICHAEL MARTINEZ,

Petitioner,

Respondents.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Case No. 3:14-cv-00282-HDM-WGC

ORDER

This is a *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, by a Nevada state prisoner. On September 15, 2014, the Court entered an order striking the proposed petition in this case because it was not submitted on the form required by this Court for petitioners proceeding *pro se*. *See* Local Rules of Special Proceedings 3-1 ("[a] petition for writ of *habeas corpus*, filed by a person who is not represented by an attorney, shall be on the form provided by this court."). The Court directed the Clerk to provide petitioner with the approved form for filing a *pro se* habeas corpus petition. Petitioner was directed to file an amended petition, using the court-approved habeas corpus form, within thirty days from the date of the order filed September 15, 2014. (ECF No. 3). Because it appeared that petitioner failed to comply with the Court's order to file an amended petition, the Court dismissed the instant action by order filed October 29, 2014. (ECF No. 4). Judgment was entered the same date. (ECF No. 5).

It has come to the Court's attention that on October 7, 2014, petitioner prepared and signed a petition using the court-approved form. Petitioner attached to the petition a copy of the Court's order of September 15, 2014, filed in the instant case, requiring the filing of an amended petition on

the court-approved form. However, the Clerk of Court opened the petition as a new case under case number 2:14-cv-1899-JCM-NJK. The petition was signed on October 7, 2014. Petitioner swears under penalty of perjury that he that he gave his *in forma pauperis* application to prison officials for mailing on October 7, 2014. Thus, it appears that petitioner intended his petition to be filed in the above-captioned case. In submitting the petition on October 7, 2014, petitioner complied with the Court's order of September 15, 2014. Therefore, by order filed May 18, 2015, the Court directed the Clerk of Court to file the petition and accompanying motions in the instant case. The Court closed case number 2:14-cv-1899-JCM-NJK. (ECF Nos. 6, 7, 8).

Under the circumstances, the interests of justice are best served by reopening the above-captioned case. Based on the information regarding petitioner's financial status, the Court finds that the motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* shall be granted. The Court has reviewed the habeas petition, and it shall be served on respondents.

Petitioner has filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel. (ECF No. 8). Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(2)(B), the district court has discretion to appoint counsel when it determines that the "interests of justice" require representation in a habeas corpus case. Petitioner has no constitutional right to appointed counsel in a federal habeas corpus proceeding. *Pennsylvania v. Finley*, 481 U.S. 551, 555 (1987); *Bonin v. Vasquez*, 999 F.2d 425, 428 (9th Cir. 1993). The decision to appoint counsel is within the Court's discretion. *Chaney v. Lewis*, 801 F.2d 1191, 1196 (9th Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 481 U.S. 1023 (1987); *Bashor v. Risley*, 730 F.2d 1228, 1234 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 838 (1984). The petition on file in this action is sufficiently clear in presenting the issues that petitioner wishes to bring. The issues in this case are not complex. Counsel is not justified in this instance. Petitioner's motion for the appointment of counsel is denied.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the instant action is REOPENED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 7) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner's motion for the appointment of counsel (ECF No. 8) is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall FILE and ELECTRONICALLY SERVE the petition (ECF No. 7-1) upon the respondents.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondents shall have forty-five (45) days from entry of this order within which to answer, or otherwise respond to, the petition. In their answer or other response, respondents shall address all claims presented in the petition. Respondents shall raise all potential affirmative defenses in the initial responsive pleading, including lack of exhaustion and procedural default. Successive motions to dismiss will not be entertained. If an answer is filed, respondents shall comply with the requirements of Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Proceedings in the United States District Courts under 28 U.S.C. §2254. If an answer is filed, petitioner shall have forty-five (45) days from the date of service of the answer to file a reply.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any state court record exhibits filed by respondents shall be filed with a separate index of exhibits identifying the exhibits by number or letter. The hard copy of all state court record exhibits shall be forwarded, for this case, to the staff attorneys in the **Reno** Division of the Clerk of Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, henceforth, petitioner shall serve upon the Attorney General of the State of Nevada a copy of every pleading, motion, or other document he submits for consideration by the Court. Petitioner shall include with the original paper submitted for filing a certificate stating the date that a true and correct copy of the document was mailed to the Attorney General. The Court may disregard any paper that does not include a certificate of service. After respondents appear in this action, petitioner shall make such service upon the particular Deputy Attorney General assigned to the case.

Dated this 28th day of May, 2015.

HOWARD D. McKIBBEN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Howard DMEKiller